



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PROFESSOR EDWARD S. SHELDON (Harvard University) then presented a paper on

10. *Some Specimens of a Canadian French Dialect Spoken in Maine.**

Discussion. PROFESSOR A. MARSHALL ELLIOTT (Johns Hopkins University): This paper strikes in the line which I have often emphasized in this Association; that is, the taking up, for investigation, of what we find about us. I was delighted when PROFESSOR SHELDON told me that he proposed to give us a communication on this subject.

The paper is to me a very interesting one. This is, in the first place, a very difficult subject to treat. No one who has not tried it knows the difficulties that are encountered in classifying and arranging material taken in this way. Of course with material drawn from a single person one cannot establish general laws; one can only place before us the characteristics of the dialect in a general way.—I think that we may proceed with this subject that the writer has brought before us this morning according to a process of elimination and first strike out certain things found in her speech and then place her somewhere in the North of France. The characteristics, as pointed out by PROFESSOR SHELDON, belonging to the dialect of the Saintonge are also characteristics of some of the North French dialects. The difficulty of determining these points in any one individual are sufficiently evident to all who appreciate the subject at all.

From what I have heard and from the examples that have been given, I would agree that the woman speaks a dialect mixture such as is frequently found in Canada. There are characteristics of both North and South French speech in her language, but the most prominent features, I should say, are those of the North of France. We find little oases of South French speech made in Canada after the scattering of the Arcadian settlements in Nova Scotia; they came from South France originally and worked up through the lower counties. We frequently find little villages in the Province of Quebec where nearly all the inhabitants belonged to these Arcadian settlements and where the old South French pronunciation is preserved. I think it very likely that this woman had the dialect of the North of France and lived in one of these border towns where she was accustomed to the South French dialect. One reason why I should not put her in the South of France, that is to say either in the Saintonge or Angoumois districts, is that we do not have the speech contractions there such as we find in her speech. There is also a sort of svarabhactic effect, if I may use the term, carried out here between the consonantal combinations. This is very common in North France. It would be interesting to take these examples and compare them with the phonetic representation of the Picard Dialect as presented by MR. EDWARD PARIS in his translation of St. Matthew into Picard, where there is a phonetic representation of the dialect.

*Cf. TRANSACTIONS in present volume for the full paper.

With reference to *ch*, where we have *chel*, for instance PROFESSOR SHELDON gave us *chel*. There is a curious mixture which would carry us to the South of France and the provincial dialect of the later stage of the North French dialect, particularly of Picardy. The *ch* sound has to-day gone almost into *sh*. I can speak from personal experience, having spent part of last summer in Picardy. Instead of saying *chel* they say *shel*. It is only the oldest people who use the palatalized form. Here is a characteristic which belongs both to the North and to the South. Taking the other characteristics, I should say that we must classify this dialect as belonging to the north, but to an older stage of the language than that which we now have in the present Picardy. The exception which PROFESSOR SHELDON mentions is quite characteristic. With reference to *chi*, it is a curious fact that while in Picardy they always say *shel* for *chel*, they say *ki* for *chi*.

There are other striking traits, such for instance as are sometimes found at the end of words; for example, in the case of *oredge*. There we have a direct characteristic of South France. I do not know how we should get at the separation exactly of South and North French characteristics except by taking out features like these and classifying together those that belong to the North of France. There is one characteristic of the North of France dialect which I did not hear mentioned, that is the transference of the vowel in the combination *re*, (*er*, *ar*), etc. In all compound forms of *re* you find in the North of France, particularly in Picardy, this change. There are other things which place the pronunciation decidedly in the North of France. PROFESSOR SHELDON pronounces *louè*, *rouè*. This is the sixteenth century pronunciation but it remains in Picardy to-day just as you find it in Canada. This may be reckoned as strictly a North French trait. In Picardy also the *oi*-sounds have a *wa* sound. I would say that possibly these forms came, in greater or less degree, from contact with the French of to-day.—There are still many other things that would place this dialect in the north but I will take the time to mention only one or two of them here.—With reference to the palatalization of the guttural sound *k*, this is found throughout Canada. They rarely say *curé*, but always *kyuré*. The common people often run this into *tchuré*. There is another characteristic which PROFESSOR SHELDON mentions and which would place the dialect in the north. In the east of Canada and in Nova Scotia I found a few years ago that the French *a* was preserved there as well as throughout a large portion of the St. Lawrence. I noticed there the form which PROFESSOR SHELDON speaks of as the broad *a*, such as is used on the St. Lawrence, in Picardy and in Normandy. In Nova Scotia, the inhabitants preserve the clear short *æ* found in modern French. I think, then, that the prominent characteristics of this woman's dialect would place it the North of France. The whole paper is extremely interesting and is precisely what we want in our Association; to collect what we find about us, is our great mission.

PROFESSOR EDWARD S. SHELDON; There is a little more to be said before assigning a North of France origin to this dialect. The sound *ch* is not peculiar to the north of France. There are other peculiarities to which I might refer, I think, to show that the type is of north or central France. The reason that I selected *h* is because there is no northern dialect which shows the sound of *h* similar to that of *j* except that of the Saintonge.

PROFESSOR A. MARSHALL ELLIOTT: They have the *h* strongly aspirated in Picardy. In the translation of *St. Matthew* by MR. PARIS, you will find that his transcription represents the *h* as strongly aspirated *h*. This corresponds with other French authors.

PROFESSOR GUSTAF KARSTEN (Indiana University): I would ask PROFESSOR SHELDON under what conditions the *æ* appears as *aw*?

PROFESSOR SHELDON; I omitted that. How closely the two sounds in the dialect correspond I am not able to say. The sounds *oi* might possibly be due not only to the influence of ordinary French, but also to the different pronunciations of *oi* itself in different words.

The next communication presented was by DR. JULIUS GOEBEL (Johns Hopkins University):

11. *On Paul's 'Principien der Sprachgeschichte.'**

Discussion. PROFESSOR GUSTAF KARSTEN (Indiana University): I am much gratified with the paper, and we are all much pleased that DR. GOEBEL has, at least, been paying attention to this subject. We all remember with some regret that two years ago he complained of the amount of publications of this kind occurring every year. It seems that he has paid more attention, in the meanwhile, to the subject and I am quite sure that we may expect good results from such conscientious earnestness; but, with reference to the present paper, I must say that I have some objections to make.

In the first place, I cannot agree with the style that the writer has been pleased to use. I hope he does not mean to deny that PAUL has made all honest efforts to throw light directly upon the point in question. It is difficult to say much about my colleague's ideas because I have not fully understood them. Most of the paper is filled up with reports of PAUL's ideas and philosophy accompanied by some supplementary remarks by the writer. This is more negative than positive. DR. GOEBEL appears not to have had time to give us his own ideas upon the subject. Whatever are his ideas on psychology and philosophy, I think that matters very little, and has little to do with linguistic investigation. Whether we accept an idealistic soul, or whether we consider it as a compound of notions and ideas, is a matter of little importance in a linguistic study. Whether or not the soul is able to control its own ideas, we cannot dispense with the consideration of words. Theologians agree that the universe has been created by a Supreme Being, but that does not prevent natural history from looking at the *ways* in which the universe developed. What-

*Cf. TRANSACTIONS in present volume for the full paper.